

The Christian News-Letter

No. 330

Edited by
KATHLEEN
OLISS

2nd February, 1949

THE COMMENTS by Sir Lawrence Bragg (C.N-L. No. 324) on our News-Letter on the Lambeth Conference and the British Association (C.N-L. No. 323) brought us a number of letters, chiefly from clergy. Some of the correspondents cordially welcomed the challenge and insisted that the Church must take seriously. Others protested that the attitude of the Church towards science was, in actual fact, quite different from what Sir Lawrence Bragg described

to be, and that, while he charged the Churches with setting up an imaginary attitude of scientists towards religion as an Aunt Sally, he was himself setting up an equally imaginary attitude of Christians towards science at which to throw bricks.

The question of the relation between the Christian and the scientific attitudes to life is of such wide range that the particular concern of the News-Letter that started the discussion may be lost sight of amid other questions. We cannot hope to deal comprehensively and systematically with the innumerable points that arise in a debate of this scope and magnitude. The subject is so large that Professor Lodge made no attempt in his six Supplements to develop Christian apologetic in answer to current scientific assumptions, but confined himself to the preliminary task of making clear the Christian way of looking at the world. Our

NEWS-LETTER

KNOWLEDGE OF GOD

AIMS IN POLITICS

SUPPLEMENT

UNDERSTANDING THE BIBLE

By

DANIEL JENKINS

concern in C.N-L. No. 323 was not primarily with theological issues in themselves but with noting and interpreting significant facts in the contemporary religious situation. The Lambeth Conference, we reported, had issued a statement on the nature of man which had evoked a cordial response from *Nature*, the leading scientific journal in this country. This we thought was interesting news, because it suggests that a talking point has been established between Churchmen and scientists. Sir Lawrence Bragg, we reported further, found that the discussion of the matter in the Christian News-Letter raised "intensely interesting questions". At this stage and in relation to the situation which we tried to depict, our primary interest was in the initiation of conversations, rather than in the subject-matter of those conversations, when they take place.

If scientists think that Churchmen are setting up Aunt Sallies and Churchmen think that scientists are doing the same, the first thing is to stop this futile and time-wasting proceeding. The present position in discussions of the relation between Christian faith and science is that too often people with different presuppositions, different training and different types of experience move in different planes and talk past one another. The pre-condition of any fruitful discussion of the relation of Christianity and science is that Churchmen and scientists should meet—which they do far too seldom—and discover in personal conversation what are the real issues in the debate, recognized as such by both sides. Where we have to fall back on the second or third best of discussion in print, our first aim must be not to argue but to understand. When Dr. Comfort's paper reached us, we welcomed the chance of publishing it as a help towards elucidating the issues. If we devote this News-Letter to continuing a discussion of the fundamental questions opened up in C.N-L. No. 323, our purpose is not so much to answer Dr. Comfort as to try to discover what are the central and crucial issues in the debate.

It is, of course, true that what Dr. Comfort writes is the expression of only one among many attitudes that involve a rejection of the Christian view. He himself in sending it

to us insisted that he made no claim to speak for all scientists. Even a slight acquaintance with the views of scientists to-day is sufficient to make it plain that there are the widest differences among them in their assumptions and in their attitudes towards the ultimate questions of life. Nevertheless one has in discussion to begin somewhere, and Dr. Comfort's paper seems to provide a good starting-point, because he is not only a scientist, but also a poet and novelist and has a vivid awareness of many aspects of life. In this News-Letter we shall focus attention on three questions of major importance.

1) *Reliance on Assertion*

Dr. Comfort's principal charge, to which he recurs again and again in his paper, is that, while science is becoming less and less dogmatic and claims no finality of judgment, Christians rely largely on assertion, and carry their assertions into fields in which conclusions can be tested by observable fact. The first thing to be said in regard to this charge is that there is too much truth in it. The field to which the charge relates is a very wide one in which questions of different kinds arise. It includes the affirmations of the Creed, the historical elements in Christianity, the contents of the Bible, the understanding of man's nature. It includes also the principles of morality; once the traditional code of morality has been fundamentally questioned, those who challenge it will not be satisfied with the mere re-assertion of what is denied. Dr. Comfort feels that Christians not only assert certain beliefs too easily but also set aside inconvenient findings of investigation too lightly. He mentioned in particular the conclusions of psychological and sociological enquiry into human behaviour. Even though there is far less reliance placed by Christians on arguing from some "Christian principle" than there used to be, still to Christians the temptation to argue that a certain conclusion "must follow" and that painstaking investigation is unnecessary, is an ever-present one.

We cannot discuss particular instances, because they are myriad in number and endless in variety. But in general

Dr. Comfort is laying his finger on a real weakness in the presentation of the Christian faith to men to-day. The growth of science and technics, which has been the chief formative influence in the life of recent generations, has created a new mentality. The acceptance of a neutral world of fact, indifferent to man's desires and obdurate to his supplication, has brought about a fundamental change in man's outlook. Through the expansion of scientific and technical training the majority of the population are being brought under its influence. It is to that mentality that the Church has to speak, if it is to be listened to at all.

It would be absurd to expect that every parson or ordinary lay Christian should be able to give a pat answer to the million and one questions that arise in connection with history, anthropology, psychology, sociology, and so on. That is out of the question. What matters is the temper in which questions are approached. The temper of scrupulous respect for fact is something which Dr. Comfort, and others like him, can recognize at once as either present or lacking.

In any conversation with scientists criteria of truth and error and the progressive testing of truth lie right at the heart of things. One of the most compelling things for the scientist in his own activities is the experience of the steady elimination of error by a method which he shares with his fellows. If, in contrast with this, he is confronted with what seems to him an uncriticized intuition, he can only view it with horror. To ask him to enter a world of this kind is like an invitation to step on to a quicksand. It seems to him a world of complete irrationalism with no firm standing ground or bulwark against delusion and hysteria. Without criteria of truth and falsehood a real community of belief appears to him impossible; we seem to be delivered to the vagaries of individual intuition and to have no defence against the cynical or unconscious self-interest of organized groups who live by propagating particular beliefs.

Scientists, or many of them, are ready to admit that in religious truth there may be other methods of verification than those which have been developed in the physical

ciences. But they are entitled to demand that there should be at least *some* methods, and that it should be made clear what these are.

2) *Knowledge of God*

Very well, Dr. Comfort goes on to argue, if you agree to abide by the facts, I can find no traces in the physical world from which the existence of a divine being can be inferred, nor do I see in the world as a whole any convincing evidence of moral purpose other than what has been put there by man. The question to be asked at this point is whether it is not possible to look for evidence of God in the wrong place. When we turn to the Bible (which for Dr. Comfort possesses no authority, but which he would admit to be an outstanding religious document) we find that things are quite the other way round; that belief in God is not something which men derive from the study of nature and history, but something which they *bring* to the interpretation of both nature and history. The writers of the Bible, as Professor Norman Kemp Smith has forcibly shown,¹ were so assured of the existence of God, and therefore of His providential rule, that in all times of trial and disaster, to however contrary a conclusion the events, taken by themselves, might seem to point, the assurance remained unshaken. If the knowledge of God is not reached by way of inference, nor derived from any antecedent knowledge of the phenomena of nature or the events of history, the only alternative is that our knowledge of God comes to us in direct and immediate experience. To this statement Dr. Comfort will, of course, have his instant and vehement objection. We are not, however, asking him to agree. We are trying at present to disentangle the issues.

It cannot be taken for granted that our only traffic with reality is by means of the processes of scientific investigation. There are secrets of life that can be discovered only by an act of surrender, of response, of commitment, and this is an attitude entirely different from that in which we sit in

¹ *Is Divine Existence Credible?* Philosophical Lecture to the British Academy. Oxford University Press, 18. 6d.

judgment on facts, weighing and measuring them, accepting this and rejecting that. The universe, as we experience it, is not simply something which submits passively to our enquiry and manipulation. It also addresses us. We find ourselves confronted by persons, events, situations, which make on us an unconditional claim and demand from us an absolute commitment. In scientific activity men sit in the seat of judgment. But there are also experiences in life in which a response is asked from all men, and in the way that they respond they themselves come under judgment. Human life is not simply a process of mastering man's environment by science and techniques ; it has to be lived in the tensions and conflicts of encounter and response.

Some months ago (C.N-L. No. 313) we reviewed at length a recent book on political science, which set out to expose the fallacy of the assumption that the conflicts of interest and power in the political arena can be brought under control by scientific and technical methods. The furious drama of human existence, with its titanic struggles between good and evil, light and darkness, freedom and tyranny, love and power, cannot be compressed into the framework of detached scientific observation. We shall not pursue that theme here. Our immediate concern is to point out that the assumption that the scientific and technical attitude to life is the sole or even the chief way of dealing with life and of experiencing its dealings with us may be a complete bar to an understanding of the realities not only of politics but of religion.

God is not a natural object among objects, not a particular being among other beings, that our minds can apprehend in the way that we apprehend His works. The central Christian assertion about God is that God is love. If that be true, it is in the experience of address and response, demand and answer that we come to know God. He speaks to us when we become aware of an unconditional obligation. We respond to Him when we surrender ourselves to truth and right. He is the ground of our ultimate trust and hope.

This is not to say that the experience of encounter has not to be submitted to rational tests. We are not to believe

every spirit, but "to prove the spirits whether they are of God". In what we have said about encounter we are in no way seeking an alibi from Dr. Comfort's challenge.

Acceptance of belief in God, as Professor Hodges pointed out in one of his Supplements, is a presupposition of exactly the same nature as the presupposition of an orderly universe, which science has to make in order to get to work at all; it is a presupposition, that is to say, that we are compelled to make in order that a field of experience may be opened up, which cannot be opened up without it. When the venture has been made, it receives progressive confirmation in experience, by giving a more satisfying meaning to life and enabling men to act in ways that commend themselves to their judgment as important and beneficial. But these beliefs have to be subjected to continual test, and have to be defended in the world to-day before those who are accustomed to submit all assertions and claims to rigorous scrutiny.

3) *Belief and Life*

In the attempt to discover what common ground there is between Dr. Comfort and ourselves, we take note of the fact that, as is evident from his writings and broadcast talks, he also has a faith. In his recent book, *The Novel and our Time*, he calls himself a romanticist, and explains this to mean that humanity, through the development of autonomous mind, is in a constant state of conflict with the external universe; and that it is in consequence man's chief responsibility to fight against two enemies—death and power. That might pass as a description of the Christian purpose. To define Christianity as the revelation of Life and Love would not be wide of the mark. We are not suggesting that Dr. Comfort is more of a Christian than he admits. The differences between his view and ours are deep. But it might very well happen that in the practical battle of life we might find ourselves not infrequently in the same camp. But how far does the fight against death and power make sense, if you leave out Christ and God? Who in history waged just

this battle as Christ did? Would the fight be the same thing to-day, if Christ had never lived? And does not the fight gain a new significance, if the lone fighter may believe that he is responding to some reality greater than himself? Is there not, perhaps, something of arrogance and bravado in man's attempt to impose his little ideals on cosmic forces that are wholly indifferent to them? We do not press these questions now. We do not want by giving them too quick and cheap an answer to evade the final challenge of Dr. Comfort's paper.

He might be prepared, he says, to concede much of what Christians assert, if he could find satisfying evidence that Christian belief produced in the individual lives and in the societies of men human qualities superior to those formed by other beliefs and systems. An argument about the historical facts would be out of place in the News-Letter, and it is doubtful if it would get us anywhere. The facts are legion and capable of different interpretations. We are thrown back in this matter on individual experience. We can only say that for ourselves we have encountered Christ in His Church and in the lives of His contemporary followers. Notwithstanding all the weaknesses and blemishes in historical Christianity, response to that encounter is for us an ultimate acceptance. Here we choose, we take our stand.

But when we have said this, we have to add that we know how searching his challenge is. Dr. Comfort's view is that truth, justice, and humanity will continue to exist on earth only so long as men maintain them. The Christian view implies no less. If they are not in fact waging a more vigorous and more successful war than other men against death and power, they have betrayed their cause. Unless the belief that man is a child of God, that love is the ultimate thing in the world, that men may here and now participate in eternal life, is a faith by which men are able to live triumphantly in the ordinary life of every day, the Church may go on saying what it believes to be the right things, but little heed will be paid to them.

AIMS IN POLITICS

The letter on Aims in Politics published in the last C.N-L. has provoked the following comment from another correspondent :—

“ I feel I must write about a statement in the letter quoted on page 24 of C.N-L. No. 329. The writer says : ‘ The increasing centralization of economic ownership would seem to place the people in the power of the state, as *the latter becomes less and less obliged to go to the people for financial supplies to carry on the business of government.*’ (My italics.) If by the words ‘ the increasing centralization of economic ownership ’ he means the increasing number of nationalized industries, the words in italics are just not true. And if he means to include centralization of economic ownership that is going on in firms like I.C.I., Lever Bros., etc., they are even less true.

“ The view that H.M. Government need go to the Commons for money less than formerly, because of nationalization, can only be derived from the idea that the profits of the nationalized industries pour into H.M. Government’s coffers and so enable it to avoid the horrid necessity. The nationalized industries are all being set up as public corporations (financially independent) and are being placed under the obligation of publishing properly audited accounts. Moreover, in these public corporations there are no ‘ equity ’ shares, held by H.M. Government, which enable it to scoop up surplus profits (if any). If profits are made (and the constituting Acts only require these corporations to *balance* their accounts, taking one year with another), the profits are available for development or for reduction of prices to the consumers or for higher wages if considered justified. The G.P.O. is the outstanding case in which the profits of an economic activity are merged in H.M. Government’s other finances ; and that is an example that is not being copied.”

Kathleen Bliss

UNDERSTANDING THE BIBLE

By DANIEL JENKINS

It is easy to confuse discussion of a matter by unnecessary subtlety and complexity. I am sure that the chief reason why most of us find it hard to understand the Bible is that we do not read it. The chief impulse behind the expansion of educational facilities in Protestant lands was to ensure that the common people should be able to read the Bible in the vulgar tongue. Educational facilities have been provided. The percentage of literacy is very high. Bibles are easily available at prices within the reach of all. Innumerable aids to its understanding are accessible to all who take a little trouble. But it has been well-known for a long time that though you can bring a horse to the water you cannot make him drink. And if the horse won't drink or even take a good look at the trough he cannot expect to have much of an opinion on the quality of the water.

The real question is, why do we not make a sufficient effort to try to understand the Bible? Why, in fact, will we not read it? Obviously, the usual complaints made about it, that it is not printed in an attractive form, that the Authorized Version is often obscure and the Revised Version not much better and that it is difficult to understand what particular chapters are about without a great deal of preliminary information, are nothing like adequate to explain a resistance so deep and a bewilderment so widespread, even though in themselves they may be quite true. Surely the real reason is that the Bible is not like any other book and demands an effort of understanding and attention which no other book demands, and that it is none the less persistently treated like any other book. To understand it is a more complex operation than most people are prepared to allow.

CRITICISM NOT THE DIFFICULTY

We are accustomed to hearing that the reason for this is the rise of Biblical criticism, which prevents modern men from reading the Bible with the naïve simplicity of our forefathers. Yet this is manifestly untrue, simply as it stands. The naïve simplicity of the forefathers has been greatly exaggerated. After all, whatever differences of intellectual climate there may be between

their age and ours, the fundamental human problems, hopes and fears remain substantially the same from one generation to another, and it is with these fundamental matters that the Bible primarily deals. It has frequently been pointed out¹ that Biblical criticism is no new thing. There was a great deal of it in the first four centuries, there is not a little of it in the Bible itself, and the Reformation produced a spate of quite radical Biblical criticism. The Bible was frequently conceived of in the past in an excessively static and "two-dimensional" manner, but fundamentalism, which is, in fact, the product of a complex intellectual situation, is a comparatively modern growth.

Of course, Biblical criticism has made phenomenally rapid strides in recent years and has been the occasion, in the experience of many individuals, of considerable confusion and unsettlement. What is questionable, however, is whether Biblical criticism itself has genuinely been the cause. In itself it is a source of immense enlightenment in the task of understanding the Bible, but it has frequently appeared to be precisely the reverse. Why has it in the past been so confusingly presented and why has its result been to make confusion worse confounded?

The truth is that it is not Biblical criticism which has created the difficulty in reading the Bible, but the rise of the modern critical temper which has found it very hard to reach satisfactory terms with the Christian faith and which has used Biblical criticism as one of its weapons. Our fundamental difficulty in reading the Bible as compared with our forefathers is that whereas they shared a common universe of discourse with the Bible, we have lost it. A great gulf is fixed between us and the world of the Bible and we do not know how to bridge it.

Theologians generally try to indicate the necessity of sharing a common universe of discourse with the Bible in order to understand it by saying, in the words of the epistle to the Romans, that it is written "from faith to faith", and that the detached, sceptical observer is not standing in a place from which he can see what it is all about. Most people, on hearing that phrase, however, have to confess to a certain sinking feeling.

¹ Most recently and effectively by C. H. Dodd in *The Bible To-day* (Cambridge, 7s. 6d.).

They become convinced that the argument is now moving on to a plane where it loses touch with their experience and with all the familiar landmarks of their thought. One of our greatest needs in learning again how to read the Bible is not so much to have a proper evaluation of the place of criticism in the technical sense, whether it be literary or historical—that can easily be achieved and many excellent books give a simple account of its function—but to understand what this “from faith to faith” means.

THE UNIQUENESS OF THE BIBLE

The first step in understanding the Biblical universe of discourse is the recognition of what the uniqueness of the Bible consists in. Apart from anything else, it is unlike any other book in the sense that it is a great corpus of literature, covering many ages and including literary forms of the most diverse types, representing varying levels of maturity and insight. Not only does it record the religious history of a people for at least fifteen hundred years, but the writing of the earlier history had an important influence on the form of the later history, while, in many instances, the earlier history has been written over and recast in the light of later experience. What gives its unity to this complex mass of material, transcending even the break between the two testaments, is the conviction of all the writers of a continuity of experience running through it all. All the writers, whether they be the author of the book of Judges or of Ecclesiastes or of the Gospel of John, claim to know the same God, who has entered into covenant with His people. Unless full value is given to that fact, no attempt to understand the Bible is likely to get far. How easy it is to lose sight of it is proved by the experience of those in our own day who read the Bible primarily as “a literary document of great power” or as “a study in the development of the religious consciousness”, and who find as a result that their reading becomes highly selective, finding tolerable only passages which appeal to their fancy for reasons other than those which the Bible would consider important. Thus many people to-day, partly as a result of Sunday school teaching, find that they know and admire the story of Joseph or the history of Saul and David without having the faintest idea of their significance in the context of the Bible,

while they are repelled by stories of crucial importance like that of the Exodus because they are told in an unfamiliar idiom and from a point of view which has never been adequately explained to them. Our fathers saw the Bible, to some extent, in the same way as those who wrote it, and this often makes the comments of an old-fashioned writer like Matthew Henry, not to say the early Fathers and the Reformers, more critically reliable than those of many modern critics, despite the possession by the latter of superior apparatus for the scientific examination of documents.

THE BIBLE AND THE CHURCH

The corollary of this recognition of the uniqueness of the Bible is the fact that the Bible can only be understood adequately in terms of the life of the society which claims to maintain continuity of experience with the life of the Bible, namely the Church. This is a principle common to both Protestantism and Catholicism, although they interpret it differently. It must not be understood too crassly or externally, as it is by those who insist that the Bible can only be studied in a "church" school or in a "church" atmosphere of the emaciated and clericalized kind which often obtains in modern England. What the claim that the Bible must be studied in the context of the life of the Church means is that the facts of which the Bible speaks are living facts, needing to be interpreted in the light of the on-going common life of the people of God, with whom God has dealings now, as He had dealings with them in Biblical times. The life of the Church is a continuation of Scripture, even though it is in Scripture that the crucial experiences which are normative for the Church's understanding of itself are to be found. The Church, indeed, may be defined as the place where the Scriptures are opened, listened to and lived by.

This motion is, once again, perfectly familiar nowadays to the theologians but it has dropped out of the consciousness of the ordinary man. Even when he holds the Church in high esteem he does not link up his relation with it with the dynamic understanding of Scripture I have tried to describe. Until it is re-established, it is hard to see how he can continue to be anything but bewildered by the Bible.

The truth of this is brought home by the fact that it is easy to exaggerate the extent to which the real message of the Bible is

readily intelligible and manifest even to those who read it. It is the nature of the world in the Bible's sense to misunderstand the Gospel. We are often reminded that the common people heard our Lord gladly, but we are not so often reminded that He rebuked them for misunderstanding the parables and gave up His public ministry. "The world through its wisdom knew not God" and the proclamation of the Gospel has always sounded to it as foolishness. We ourselves, as we come to the Scriptures, partake of the nature of the world. Even when we have known what it is to stand in the succession of faith, we have to make an effort to retain the Biblical perspective, because the Bible's way of looking at things is not that natural to fallen man. If men are to understand the Bible aright it must be opened in a way which "speaks to their condition".

THE BIBLE AND THE SERMON

It is this which is the primary purpose of the sermon. I must confess that the attitude of many of the laity towards sermons is one which passes my comprehension. Few—partly because they have been inadequately taught—have a clear comprehension of the true purpose of the sermon. And, if the true purpose of the sermon is not comprehended by either preacher or hearer, it seems to me obviously one of the most boring and profitless of activities. Yet, out of a quite mistaken sense of duty, many good Christian people will put up indefinitely with dreary, platitudinous, meandering and pointless discourses, and excuse them on the ground that, after all, the parson is a good fellow. The Churches need to reaffirm to-day the true nature of preaching, and the laity to demand that true preaching be restored to them, as of right, if they are to learn properly to understand the Scriptures again.

What does this opening of the Scriptures, which is the function of true preaching, involve? At least three things.

First, the preacher must be one of those who stand in the succession of those who speak from faith to faith. He must possess the key to the Scriptures. He must possess the reality and not merely the form of the apostolic succession, knowing what the apostle means when he says, "For I received of the Lord that which also I handed over to you".

Secondly, the " opener " of Scripture must understand the context to which the message of the Bible is relevant. He must know, as far as is possible, when a particular passage was written, by whom and for whom it was written, whether light is thrown upon its meaning from other sources and what its place is in the whole story which the Bible records. This, of course, is what the work of textual, literary and historical criticism attempts to do. This work is an indispensable adjunct of the right understanding of Scripture and there can be no doubt that in itself it has greatly enriched our understanding of the meaning of Scripture and its significance for us to-day. Its use provides no problem for faith, unless it is assumed that the method itself rules out in advance the truth of the witness of faith to the mighty acts of God which the Bible records.

This assumption may, of course, be true, but it cannot be taken for granted, nor is it necessarily involved in the use of the critical method. Few responsible critics would claim that it is, but in the modernist period many critics regarded it as their primary duty, not to do what has been described in the previous paragraph, but to produce a reasonable explanation of what is recorded in Scripture on the assumption that, where it appeared to transgress the laws of credibility which modern " scientific " man had laid down for himself, it was mistaken. That assumption must be examined and it is part of the purpose of the preacher, in expounding Scripture, always to be aware of it and occasionally to bring it out into the open and face it. What he cannot do is to assume that the question is settled in advance. That cuts the nerve of effective preaching and is the cause of the embarrassment of many preachers to-day, who have to expound the Bible in which neither they nor their hearers believe.

Thirdly, " opening " the Scriptures involves an attempt to relate it to the situation in which we find ourselves as men to-day. We all know the sermon which is impeccably orthodox in content or which is a very close exposition of Scripture, but which somehow leaves its hearers cold because the preacher has not led on from that to what God is saying here and now.

Understanding the Bible is thus a more complex operation than is commonly supposed. A German theologian has said, " The Bible is not a book to be read, but a book to be preached ".

That may seem a characteristic German overstatement and in one sense it obviously is. Many parts of the Bible have an immediate and direct appeal to its readers, even if they know little of the background and circumstances, and it is always vital that those whom the preacher addresses should have direct access to the Bible for themselves. Nevertheless, this saying is a reminder both that the Bible is not always self-explanatory and that it needs to be interpreted in terms of our own concrete situation to-day before its full import becomes manifest. The ordinance of preaching may not be indispensable for the hearing of the Word of God in the Bible, but, when it is properly performed, it can be one of the greatest of the "helps" which God provides for His people in living the Christian life. Listening to sermons is no substitute for private reading of the Bible. On the contrary, preaching is partly aimed at helping people to read their Bibles more effectively and needs such reading as a check. But one of the chief reasons why the Bible is not understood to-day is that too few sermons faithfully expound it.

A spectacular revival of Biblical reading and understanding is not likely in our own day to come by itself. It will come only as part of a renewal of the Church as the society which listens to and lives by the Word of God. This is not to minimize the value or influence of organizations like the Bible Reading Fellowship, whose membership steadily grows and has now reached 384,000; nor is it to disparage the importance of the Bible in national education or to assert that inter-denominational agreed syllabi are useless. Every opportunity of teaching the Bible should be seized. What is essential is that when it is taught its distinctive nature and message should be made clear, and that all who study it should be made to see that for an adequate understanding participation in the common life of the people of God is necessary.

Subscriptions—£1 (\$4.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year, 10s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies, 10d.; reduction for quantities.

Indices—Vols. I—XIII (Oct. 1939—Dec. 1948), 1s. each post free.

Folders—To hold six months' supply, 3s. each post free.

Bound Volumes—Vols. II—XII (May 1940—Dec. 1947) 15s. each post free, or 12s. 6d. each in sets of four or more consecutive volumes.

All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—
THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1

Published by the Christian Frontier Trust, Ltd., and printed in Great Britain
by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.